

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOSEPH ANTHONY BARRETT,

Plaintiff,

v.

G. BERRY, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [19-cv-01923-HSG](#)

**ORDER GRANTING REQUEST TO
CHANGE DEADLINE FOR REPLYING
TO MOTIONS TO CHANGE TIME;
DENYING AS MOOT REQUEST TO
CHANGE BRIEFING SCHEDULE**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 27, 28

Now pending before the Court are plaintiff's requests that (1) the Court allow plaintiff ten (10) days to respond to any motions to change time (Dkt. No. 27), and (2) that the court deny defendants' request for an extension of time to file their dispositive motion, Dkt. No. 23, to the extent that the request shortens plaintiff's time to respond to any dispositive motion from forty-five days to thirty days (Dkt. No. 28). The Court construes the latter request as requesting a change in the briefing schedule because the Court has already granted defendants an extension of time to file their dispositive motion, Dkt. No. 26.

Good cause being shown, the Court GRANTS plaintiff's request that the Court allow plaintiff ten (10) days to respond to any motions to change time. The Court DENIES as moot plaintiff's request for a change in the briefing schedule because the revised briefing schedule allows plaintiff forty-five (45) days to file his opposition to any dispositive motion. *See* Dkt. No. 26. Should plaintiff find that he requires more than forty-five days to prepare his opposition, he may file a motion requesting an extension of time to file his opposition.

//

//


//

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

This order terminates Dkt. Nos. 27 and 28.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 11/5/2019


HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
United States District Judge